UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

The Depression and the Spiritual Life

By ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

From Geneva to New York via London

By SYDNEY STRONG

Russia and Disarmament

By

I. M. LITVINOFF

II. WILFRED WELLOCK

In Memoriam—Dean Fenn

By PERCY W. DAWSON

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 8

Chicago, April 25, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*
Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 115
The Depression and the Spiritual Life—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 117
Jottings—J. H. H. 118
ARTICLES—
Our Correspondent Returns to Geneva!—Letter from Sydney Strong 115
From Geneva to New York via London—SYDNEY STRONG..... 119
Russia and Disarmament:
I. Disarmament—M. LITVINOFF..... 121
II. The Russian Disarmament Proposals—Facing Realities —WILFRED WELLOCK..... 123
In Memoriam—Dean Fenn—PERCY M. DAWSON.....125
POETRY—
Quest—FANIA KRUGER..... 118
The Challenge of the Night—CHARLES G. GIRELIUS..... 124
THE STUDY TABLE—
The Lyrics of Liberalism—EDWIN FAIRLEY..... 125
Rebel Poets—LUCIA TRENT..... 126
Remake America!—JAMES A. FAIRLEY..... 126
Note—Two Hymnbooks..... 126
CORRESPONDENCE—
Seminar in Mexico—HUBERT C. HERRING..... 127
A Sad Commentary—H. S. N..... 127
THE FIELD—
American League for India's Freedom..... 114
An Open Letter—W. I. L..... 127
Gandhi and Englishmen..... 127

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

American League for India's Freedom

UNITY is pleased to announce the organization of the "American League for India's Freedom." The National Committee of the League is headed by Dr. J. T. Sunderland, Honorary Chairman, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Chairman, and Rev. John Howland Lathrop, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, and Hon. Frank Murphy, Mayor of Detroit, Vice-Chairmen. Members of the National Committee include such distinguished names as Dr. Peter Ainslie, Devere Allen, Roger Baldwin, Alice Stone Blackwell, Harry L. Dana, W. E. B. DuBois, Bishop Frederick B. Fisher, William Floyd, Elizabeth Gilman, Rabbi Sidney E. Goldstein, Fanny Hurst, Paul Kellogg, Robert Morss Lovett, Judge Julian W. Mack, Fred Atkins Moore, Rabbi Lewis I. Newman, Reinhold Niebuhr, William Pickens, Charles Edward Russell, Upton Sinclair, Sidney B. Snow, Oswald Garrison Villard, Robert Whitaker, and Eliot White. Members of the UNITY family on the National Committee include Edmund B. Chaffee and Jesse H. Holmes.

The purpose of this League is to establish a bureau of information about India, gather and publish accurate news of what is going on in India, cultivate and correct public opinion toward the Indian cause, and in general sustain in this country the great struggle of Gandhi and the Indian National Congress for India's freedom. Specifically, the League is organized "to express American support of Indian independence through non-violence."

The League is already gathering members and collecting funds. It has established an office at 383 Bible House, New York City, and placed there a secretary, Miss Eleanor Metzel. It has published three bulletins, which will be continued at regular fortnightly intervals under the editorial direction of Mr. Richard B. Gregg, who lived for three years in India, part of the time at the Ashram, is a friend of Gandhi, and a man in close and direct touch with every development of the Indian situation at the present time. In preparation is a public manifesto in support of India's cause which will be given to the world over the signatures of one hundred outstanding American citizens. It is hoped as time goes on to extend publication work, conduct public meetings in various parts of the country, and organize wherever possible local groups of friends of India. Membership in the League is strictly limited to American citizens.

Support of the "American League for India's Freedom," especially at this moment when it is just launching its work, is imperatively needed. Here is a chance for all friends of India and lovers of Gandhi to do something for the great cause. Join the League

(*Continued on page* 127)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1932 Number 8

OUR CORRESPONDENT RETURNS TO GENEVA!

New York City, April 10, 1932.

Editor of UNITY:

Have decided to go back to Geneva.

No sooner had I landed in America—where I expected to stay—than I felt a call to go back, not having completed my work. The ocean trip may have reminded me of the Jonah-parable, where one was ordered to preach "the preaching that I bid thee" and instead went westward.

At any rate, I hope to be in Geneva again by the 20th of April, for several months. My sole purpose will be to observe the work for peace, and promote measures in the direction of Total Disarmament *now.*

I have discovered, I think, where the dominant power of control in the Conference lies. At that point I shall work. My idea, which amounts to an expectation, is that the Conference may in *some divine hour of deadlock,* when other proposals are seen to be futile, turn to the sane and simple method of *total disarmament now.* This would be the shortest and surest road to real disarmament—instead of the road, which leads to no one knows where!

Your kind assurances that my messages from Geneva have been of interest to the readers of Unity, encourage me to believe that you wish me to continue along like lines, to be as it were a kind of ambassador of Unity— much as Stanley went into darkest Africa as the ambassador of the New York Herald—to explore the Darkest Hell of War, and report on signs of abolition.

I shall be especially interested in noting signs of drift in that direction—for there lies the great hope for real, permanent peace. I feel keenly that total disarmament is closer to earth, this year, 1932, than ever before—and perhaps nearer than it will be for generations. Now is the time.

Should anyone care to send on suggestions, information, etc., I shall welcome such partnership.

My address in Geneva will be care, The American Express.

Most cordially yours,

SYDNEY STRONG.

Edwin Markham is celebrating his 80th birthday! A great meeting was held at Carnegie Hall in New York on March 24th, when men and women from far and wide assembled gladly to greet their beloved bard. More truly than any other American poet, with the single exception of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Markham has won his way into the hearts of the people and there found his sure abiding place. With Edwin Markham today, as with Longfellow yesterday, personality is the initial secret of this achievement. The one man, like the other, looks and acts the poet! Markham, we imagine, has more sheer gusto than Longfellow ever had; but the joy of life, the love of humanity, the radiation and illumination of inner spirit, are the same. Markham, however, is more than a personality. He is a poet by virtue of genius and by right of great accomplishment. A considerable portion of his work, as of the work of all fertile writers, is of an ephemeral character. But few poets of our time have kept to so consistently high a level of characteristic expression; and again and again he has been lifted to the heights of inspiration. Edwin Markham is among the limited number of contemporary writers who can contemplate works which are destined not to die. "The Man with the Hoe" is as immortal as the canvas which kindled the divine spark within the poet's breast. So long as the memory of Abraham Lincoln endures, Markham's poem on the Great Emancipator will be cherished as the noblest tribute ever paid to his great memory. "The Circle" is a mere trifle in appearance, but as enduring in its truth and beauty as a blazing atom. Other poems might easily be added, all evidence of Markham's permanent place in the galaxy of singers who have used the English tongue. But Markham is more than poet —he is prophet as well! For he has never dreamed alone on isles of quiet, or climbed his ivory tower to be apart from men. The toiling multitudes of the world, the hunted and hated of the race, these are all his brothers, and for their sakes he pleads for the speedy coming of the just and free society. If Markham sings, he also thunders. He strikes his lyre before the altar-fires of God. Blessings on his eighty years! May he live to touch the century's mark!

Another "affair" has broken out at Columbia University, to show anew the brand of liberalism which prevails in that institution. Long since, of course, the University has taken on the character and color of its head, Nicholas Murray Butler, the champion "fair-weather" hero of all time. Master of a trenchant pen and an eloquent tongue, President Butler has built up something like a world-wide reputation as a leader of liberal opinion. But his leadership is only a leadership of words, for quiet and easy times. Let a test come, in the hours that try men's souls, and Butler

proves himself the blackest and blindest of reactionaries. Thus, in the days before 1914, the President of Columbia was one of the most fulsome flatterers of and fawners upon the German Kaiser; the moment, however, the Kaiser became unpopular, Butler led the pack that howled upon his trail. In days of peace, no man so ardent a pacifist as the sage of Morningside Heights; let war come, however, and he is straightway the most ferocious of militarists. In between campaigns, President Butler is a political independent, a stern critic of party policies, and an ardent crusader for the right; on election day, however, he puts on the shackles and votes the Republican ticket, even though it be headed by a Harding. We would like to know one time, in all Nicholas Murray Butler's long career, when in the hour of crisis he has sustained his words with deeds. Certainly the list of the free minds and brave spirits who have found the scholar's life impossible under this autocrat's rule is one of the most dark and dire records in American life. Edward MacDowell, Joel E. Springarn, James Harvey Robinson, Charles A. Beard, J. McKeen Cattell, Harry Dana —this is only a beginning of the list of those who have retired or been fired from Columbia. And now it is a young student who has been expelled from the University because he dared to have an independent mind and a pen quick to tell the truth! Sternly refusing to question the action of a weak and timid dean—heartily concurring, in fact, in what an underling, taking example from his chief, has done—Nicholas Murray Butler again justifies Upton Sinclair's unforgettable indictment of him in "The Goose-Step."

It still remains a mystery to us why Clarence Darrow went to Honolulu. This Massie case does not seem to match up with the other great cases which have caught the interest and won the support of this great advocate. The Heywood, Moyer and Pettibone case, the McNamara case, the Sweet case, the Dayton (Tennessee) case, even the Leopold-Loeb case involved issues which do not seem to appear in this Hawaiian case at all. This last is a particularly vulgar, cruel, and cowardly case of murder, so far as we can make out. Why should Darrow be in it? Not for mercenary reasons, of course. If ever there was a man free of the lust of money, it is this Chicago lawyer who is ending a long and successful life still relatively poor in this world's goods. The lure of the battle may well have enticed him. In his "Autobiography" he gives every sign in the closing pages of retiring gladly from the fray and enjoying in quiet his few remaining days. But the aged war-horse may well have sniffed the battle from afar, and broken confinement in spite of himself. But more likely, we think, is the surmise that Darrow has heeded again the call of the distressed. The heart of this man is sensitive to the point of agony. His pity for the downtrodden, the oppressed, the attacked is the one dominant quality of his heart. Never at any time has he been able to turn away from "those who are in any trouble." It is his professional boast and his personal pride that he has always served as a lawyer for the defense, and never has seen one client of his sentenced to death. It is this, we believe, which moved him to answer when the appeal came from Honolulu. He could not say "No!" Also, and finally, that our analysis may be complete, there may well be elements involved in the Massie case with which we are not familiar. Clarence Darrow's presence before the bar helps to persuade us that the defendants have a better case than has yet been presented in the newspapers. Still does it remain strange, however, to see Darrow standing not for but against the colored peoples of the Islands.

UNITY was among the few papers in this country which refused to be elated over the outcome of the first presidential election in Germany. We regarded it as a mingling of ignorance and superficial judgment to discover grounds for satisfaction in Hindenburg's failure to win a majority of German votes, and in Hitler's amazing success in nearly doubling, in less than two years' time, the number of his supporters. Now has come the second and final election, to confirm our foreboding over the situation. Hindenburg's enormous prestige was again cast into the balances, and the whole force of government thrown behind his campaign. Every imaginable device of an administration that has suspended the constitution and is ruling by virtue of dictatorial powers, was used to discredit and suppress the Fascist chieftain. His offices were raided and papers seized; his party was deliberately and loudly charged with high treason; he and his speakers were denied all use of the radio; his meetings were many of them either denied or broken up under pretext of preserving law and order. With what result? That Hindenburg was elected, of course! He is one man in Germany who is unbeatable. But the President's previous total of voters was cut down by more than a million, and Hitler's raised by more than two millions to the alarming total of over 13,000,000. The Fascists have not been beaten. A few years ago Hitler was the absurd leader of a little group of black reactionaries. Steadily since then he has been pressing his attack, and always gaining ground. In the last two years, his movement has taken on the appearance of a flood. It mounts, like the swiftly rising tide, up and over every so-called "high-water mark" set by his desperate opponents—and the end is not yet! We marvel at the fatuousness of editors and publicists who declare that Germany's troubles are over, her future secure. The unhappy republic is in the grip of revolution. She trembles and totters beneath the blows of enemies who become more formidable every hour.

Germany may hold together as long as the 84-year old President lives. But when he dies, or even fails—what then?

We do not pretend to understand the overthrow of the government in Newfoundland by the St. John's mob. When the news came of this revolution in miniature, it seemed to us an extraordinary event. We had always thought of the Newfoundlanders as a particularly moderate, patient, stolid, even rather cold-blooded people. Certainly we know of nothing in the history of Newfoundland nor in the present situation there to match historic conditions in Ireland or in India. Yet in this remote and comparatively small place a sudden event of amazing violence outdid in passion and completeness anything that has happened in Ireland in a dozen years or in India at any time during the period of the Nationalist revolt. On the surface perhaps it may be taken as one more indication of what is happening to the British Empire, which is obviously and swiftly breaking up. Deep down, however, it is an explosion, at an unexpected place, which reveals the terrific eruptive fires which are blazing everywhere underneath the crust of our present-day society. In Newfoundland there are thousands of people out of work; families of men, women and children are starving and cold; the government is grossly extravagant; business is in a condition of incurable depression, and agriculture is ruined. A patient and long-suffering people apparently reached the point where they could stand no more, and in a few angry hours destroyed a government and produced a revolution. As a forecast of what may happen in Germany, or Hungary, or Roumania, or other European countries within a few weeks or months, in Italy or France or England within a few months or years, even in America in time if there comes no healing of our distress, the Newfoundland revolution is as momentous as its *locale* is trivial. It is amazing, almost incredible, that with such signals of disaster flying in the wind, our statesmen can still palter and debate and confer, and always do nothing at all to save our world.

When the Swedish "match king," Ivar Krueger, committed suicide some weeks ago, therewith shocking the world and shaking the markets of exchange, we stated that we were "completely unmoved, except as we shudder at the type of civilization which produces such men." We declared our conviction that Krueger, just like Stinnes and Loewenstein, was nothing but a racketeer, different from the ordinary racketeer only in the sense that he operated at the top rather than at the bottom of society. "Men of the Krueger type," we said, "have never served a useful purpose, nor done a generous deed. They have no culture, no public spirit, no idealism. They exist solely for themselves—to exploit mankind in their own exclusively selfish interests." We said this in the face of laudations of Krueger and lamentations over his tragic death which filled the newspapers of New York and of the world. Some of our readers may have thought us ill-informed, and incidentally very cruel. Now comes the news, apparently another great shock to the world but to ourselves just the thing to be expected, that Krueger's business accounts, as he left them after his death, were filled with "gross misrepresentation." The New York *Times's* special cable dispatch from Stockholm states that on "Mr. Krueger's personal instructions liabilities were wiped out and assets swollen to such figures that in some cases they appeared entirely fictitious." Here is proof of the kind of man that Krueger was, and the kind of man that all such creatures are. We are in the hands of exploiters who will do anything to advance their interests and enlarge their property holdings. It is a racketeering game, just as our society is a racketeering society. If a few more men had the decency to shoot themselves, we would still perhaps be as badly off as ever, but we would know with a more abundance of information the indecent realities of our industrial and commercial life.

The Depression and the Spiritual Life

During that part of the war which preceded the Armistice on November 11, 1918, it was the custom of professional moralists generally to talk about the great spiritual uplift that humanity was receiving. Men were rotting in filthy trenches, they were being disemboweled by shrapnel, they were slaughtering each other with bayonets. The battle-front was one vast gladiatorial arena, the world a mighty Colosseum filled with wildly cheering spectators. The topmost rows, being farthest from the battle field, shrieked the loudest: "At 'em boys!" "No mercy!" "Kill, kill, kill!" The awful noise drowned the feeble and protesting cries from those whose beloved ones fought in the arena. And above all this hideous din there arose the shrill voice of the preacher, as men and women lashed themselves into hysterical frenzy: "This is the way of life. This is the dawn of a new day for humanity. Man is being redeemed from his crass materialism. This is the spiritual regeneration of the nation." Patriots in every country affirmed the glory of this baptism of fire. Out of a preaching of hate, even as the lily springs out of the mud, the preachers affirmed that a new spiritual life was being born.

But the war did not end with the Armistice; it merely changed its form. The war to end war has not ended. The struggle for peace still goes on. What we call the Depression is an integral part of the war, just as much as the convalescent period is a

part of the disease after the crisis. The preachers are still hopeful. The frenzy of the crowd is not quite so intense. We hear more frequently and more clearly the cries of the wounded and the moans of the broken and beaten. But these professional moralists, who seemed for a time to be not quite so sure of the "great spiritual uplift of humanity," are renewing their prophetic note with increasing assurance. The suffering of the present day is to them evidently the work of the hand of God, who is smiting us in his wrath for our sins. We have had too much riches and have forgotten God. Now we are being stripped of our wealth and we will return to him. The back-ground of this teaching is the old idea, "Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth." Calvinism affirms that only those "whom God hath elected" may look forward to a "life of eternal ecstacy and bliss." Here at hand is an evidence of election, for the Lord will surely elect "those whom he loveth."

A strange thing about this situation is that the people who are being chastened the most are the people who were the least afflicted with great riches. The great multitude who today vainly cry for work or stand dumbly in the "bread line" are for the most part those who never had the opportunity to succumb to the temptation of great wealth.

It is to be admitted that here in America at least a great stream of money is flowing out from those who have to those who have not. Community chests have been filled to over-flowing. Many people are giving and giving until "it hurts," even as they did years ago. How much of this great stream of wealth is due to the fear of what may happen if the great army of the hungry continues to increase, we do not know. Even admitting that all of it is an expression of genuine good-will and sympathy, yet it remains a strange doctrine that man's spiritual nature on the whole is being lifted to higher plane through the present break-down of the Capitalistic system. If it is true, then men must agree that war is the way of life.

Unquestionably, there are those who rise above sorrow, frustration, and defeat. There are those who profit by misfortune and are not beaten by fate. But the progress of mankind has been through overcoming. It is the mastery of nature that has given man courage and a high faith in his powers to find more and more leisure as well as security. To accept the present situation in the world as from the hand of God, and intended for the well-being and spiritual growth of mankind, is sheer denial of man's capacity to solve his own problems.

We must live through this period of the war as we lived through the earlier period. But let us recognize it for what it is. Mankind will rise to higher levels, but his rising will not be aided by those who complacently accept for others hunger, starvation, and all the accompanying ills as the kindly and loving methods of a good God seeking to lead men to a higher spiritual life.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Jottings

Reginald A. Reynold's poem, "Ballad of the Brave Captain," published in UNITY in the February issue, has been republished in the *Literary Digest* as one of the outstanding specimens of "current poetry" in America.

Andrew Mellon is cheerful about the situation. He says that America is at last "getting down to fundamentals." We didn't know that this was what it is called, but there is no doubt that America is "getting down" there.

The "wets" persist in arguing that "light wines and beers" would serve the cause of temperance. That is, less liquor would be manufactured and consumed. At the same time they argue that this legislation would help to solve the unemployment problem! To cut down production and consumption and at the same time increase employment is indeed a miracle. Our "wets" are funny when they are not just plain thirsty.

A bonus of $2,000,000,000 to the soldiers seems intolerable, and we are against it. But when we remember that exactly this same stupendous sum of money was recently handed out to the bankers, how can we blame the veterans?

Germany has prepared her new budget, and has definitely removed the item of reparations. Not one more mark will she pay to France or any other allied power. Thus ends a tragic and ridiculous chapter of contemporary history!

DEFINITIONS—(10) *Political platform.*—Window dressing!

J. H. H.

Quest

Without the spark there cannot be a flame.
A potter cannot mold without the clay;
Seeds must be sown. The light of sages came
From inner glow: A search will find the way.

FANIA KRUGER

From Geneva to New York via London

[From Our Special Correspondent]

To travel up to Lausanne, to Basle, to Cologne, to London via the Hook, to Southampton and on to New York is to pass over important ways of the world. As you lie in your berth on the Atlantic there is passing before your mind a film of history. At Geneva you are thinking of world peace; at Lausanne and Basle, of world finance; at Cologne, of Europe's restoration; at London, of an empire in process of world movement.

The Rhine is an unforgettable river in human affairs—the Euphrates or Nile of today. Six o'clock a. m. found me rolling into the big station at Cologne. I handed my valises to a porter and said, "Hotel." I find such porters even more reliable than a Baedekar, being absolutely up to date, and advise from personal observation. In two minutes, I was in a nice, clean hotel—of course, the rule in Germany.

My first impression of conditions in Germany I gained from the elevator-boy. I praised the rubber-ball that was fastened to the room key and remarked, "You Germans are very ingenious." . . . "Yes, that's the trouble. We have too much machinery, and no work." His remark opened a little window on the state of affairs.

After coffee, rolls and jam, I strolled across the Dom Platz. Ten years before, I had seen British soldiers occupying the "Dom" hotel and "governing" the town. One is always nauseated when one is reminded of the crimes of war. This was all done in the shadow of the famous Cathedral—and Christendom made no effective protest.

I passed into the Cathedral. To its credit, it is open early. It was easy to find the "Eingang." But, how cold! One is nearly frozen. I had with me a copy of "His Last Week"—a story of the week before Easter. I read of the children in the Temple, who were rebuked by the priests for their shouts of praise. Rather strikingly, as I read, I saw a group of boys and girls standing before a ticket window, over which was a sign, "Tickets to Choir and Treasury"—there was no joy on their faces, for they did not have the price of admission.

I stood long before a huge window in the South Transept. It was of the Conversion of Saul, on his way to Damascus. Above is a vision of the Christ, who is saying, "Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Saul was on his way to kill Christians. When Saul *saw* the Christ he was thrown from his horse to the ground. The "man on horseback" is no more! And what is more, his sword is thrown from his hand and lies broken on the ground. . . . From that hour, he proclaims the way of non-violence and love. Naturally, this vision warmed my heart.

I get my best knowledge of a nation by looking at the lives of a few individuals. I am fortunate to know Dr. Hertha Kraus, who has charge of Public Welfare in Cologne. I had seen her at work, ten years before, in charge of the feeding of the children of the Berlin district—in the days of Quaker good works, in the days of financial collapse and hunger. In Cologne, apart from her public work, she, with her "partner," Mrs. Schultz, is promoting a chain of non-alcohol, non-profit restaurants (cooperative). I had a splendid meal at one at about twenty cents. The house, in which they live, is located in a "cooperative community" and built on cooperative principles. From her, I found that conditions in Germany are as serious as we have been led to know for some years. The Germans pick up the work of life each day, with a sigh, but with a will to see it through. My own feeling is that this great people, if they do not become militaristic, will in the long run win success, probably higher than they would had they gone on the way of the first decade of 1900. My expectation is based on acquaintance of people of brain and character, like Hertha Kraus, devoted to the public weal.

In crossing the Channel by the Hook to Harwich I drew, to my profit, a nice Indian young man for a room-mate. In the long taxi drive from Liverpool Station to Friends House, Euston Road, I heard again the roar of a great city. Friends House is a very interesting institution, having a recently erected building of mammoth proportions, on one of the busiest ways of London. It deserves a story by itself. Here bob and nabob from the ends of the earth are welcome. In the fine auditorium, just the night before my arrival, the Communists had held a mass-meeting. Here is where Gandhi made his first address to a London audience. When in London, better omit seeing the Bank than miss Friends House. A prison record will neither commend you, nor debar you.

At Friends House I was met by John P. Fletcher, who for my two days in London was "guide, philosopher and friend." A remarkable man. Him also I had met in Berlin, when he, as head of English Quaker-feeding, and Dr. Kraus, were in the same work of beneficence.

Among other places, he showed me his suburban home situated in a large space covering miles, to the north of London, where is a community built on the principle of cooperation. This principle forbids fences between neighbors—so contrary to the former idea of every home with a fence and garden. I noted also that broad boulevards had been provided, that ran through the community, as by-roads, being so laid out that autos could go madly along, on the way from London to Edinboro, without touching pedestrians.

One of the two days in London chanced to be Good Friday, and so the people were either resting or recreating—or, more likely, out of town. We saw a powerful anti-war film, of German make, called "War is Hell." At times, we felt like crying out in pain and horror. We agreed that if this film could be shown to Geneva—to all of the citizens and especially the Conference delegates—it would lead to drastic action. The film carries a prelude by Gilbert Murray—and if it only could be shown in the Glass House free to everybody! We even discussed ways of carrying a plan through!

We covered the ground pretty well from Hyde Park to Victoria Park in the East End—strolling much and taking bus between regions. Hyde Park orators were spouting—like "Old Faithful" of Yellowstone. We listened to a Socialist, as he discussed the dangers of riches. In his ramblings, America was referred to as the "land where a crook could become a millionaire!" It's a great show, as one strolls from Hyde Park Corner of Orators to the Parliament buildings, where also much spouting is done. Two great Commoners—Crom-

well and Lincoln—stand guard, in stone, right over against the Abbey and the Hall. If there is any heart of London, it would be located in this spot.

As we went about London, I was certainly not impressed with the fact that England was decaying, neither as I was coming up from Harwich or going down to Southampton. I did not *see* any rags, such as were to be seen in plain evidence twenty years ago. We went out to Whitechapel district and spent an hour or more strolling about the East End Park, Victoria, where were crowds wandering about in family groups. The children looked healthy, to me. We had the pleasure of calling on "Comrade Mary Hughes," of famous family, who lives beside the road doing good. I must confess, that judging by the evidence of my eyes, the slums of East London, as I knew them, are no more. It was a glad surprise. I don't believe that my friend Fletcher was showing me the sights that "ought to be seen!" It would seem to be true, that practically everyone in Britain who is in need gets some kind of attention, that makes life tolerable. I recall a remark of Snowden, that Britain has "inexhaustible resources." Britain is not in need of sympathy from America, financially. As to debts and reparations, I held just after the war, that the sponge should be freely used, all round. However, I am inclined to believe that Britain is able to stand losses as well as America.

I made my way into several public-bars (saloons). They looked as evil and disgusting as they did twenty, thirty, forty years ago. I haven't the least desire to go back to the public saloon or bar. I have found many Englishmen eager to debate Prohibition, cock sure that America is wrong. British influence, social and financial, is apt to be hostile to Prohibition, and loses no opportunity in expressing itself. I am frank to say everywhere that I am proud of the leadership taken by America, in effort to free mankind from the vice of booze, and greatly regret that British visitors to our shores do not generally help us in our effort for human betterment. I confess, that many American travellers are poor exponents of Prohibition, or are apologetic.

When I am disposed to be critical of the British, my mind turns back to my friend Fletcher, who operating from Friends House is a kind of a Host Extraordinary to all the people of color in the Empire as they may come to London. His interest extends to the regions beyond the Empire—for evidence of which ask William Pickens, who under Fletcher's aegis spoke forty times, from London to the North of England.

Then came the voyage from Southampton to New York. Wonderful are the works of God, and wonderful are the talents of man! Who is not glad that he is part and parcel of the universe? I recall two things I did during the ocean trip: one was to discuss with a table mate—a young Scotchman, working in Boston—the ways of the "Dole." The system apparently covers the whole population, so that no one may starve. On the other hand, many may go for months and months in absolute idleness. We may well study the ways of Germany and England as they handle unemployment—to learn, but not to imitate. I am convinced that a people that lose their initiative have suffered a great loss.

A second thing I did on the voyage was to read H. G. Wells' "Work, Wealth and Happiness." A man ought to be fined who writes so many words for one book. And, Wells' book would be much better if boiled down, three-fourths. He has a great theme—the story of how and why man came to work, and to acquire wealth, and the avenue to happiness. Again, Wells is very verbose, and in places pedantic. There is a disposition to advertise his old wares, the books of his friends and to be encyclopedic. The value of his book is diluted by clear evidence of work of inferior minds, as assistants. I fear also that he has got in the hands of a publisher, who is too up on modern methods of promotion. The most disappointing feature of the book is a strain of negative faith running through the account, and at the last paragraph, you would not be surprised to hear him say, "Let us all rise and sing, 'Cheer up, worse times ahead.' ". . . I am more hopeful of England, when I think of Fletcher, instead of Wells.

And, now New York is in view. At the end of a trip, I am always glad to testify to the security of human life. I have traveled in all lands for many years, but I have never been molested, nor seen a serious accident. I found getting through customs easy. Of him that hath little, little shall be required. A citizen is almost required to rack his brains to put down something, to save face. . . . Coming through customs, I was touched by an incident. A Hungarian woman with babe in arms remarked to me, "In America, they put women with babes at the head of the waiting line. It is not so in Europe." This virtue covers a multitude of sins. I recall seeing in Geneva, Alice Paul, noble champion of human rights, seeking to get the attention of the League of Nations, in order to have the status of woman set higher than the status set by the Hague Conference, which adopted the status set for the women of Europe—but her efforts were being met by eyes of glass!

And, then New York City. Back again. Some virtues this city may lack, but the towers of no city on earth resemble so nearly the towers of a Celestial City, whose maker is God!

SYDNEY STRONG.

Some Astonishing Astronomical Revelations

I hear the people up in Mars have bottled up their air in jars, and if you want to breathe up there you have to buy yourself some air. And if you're poor (or so I hear) you die from lack of atmosphere. Yet wealthy Martians always praise these good, old-fashioned Martian ways, whereby the thrifty always thrive, and have to work to keep alive: and but for this (it's very plain) no one would ever work again.

I'm told the people in the Moon will die of hunger very soon. They've grown so many tons of wheat that there is more than they can eat; and so the farmers have destroyed the surplus, but the unemployed *still* find no market for their toil upon their native moonland soil. And so, for want of cash, they die—which seems so *very* strange that I could not believe in such a fix save in a world of lunatics.

They say the people in the Sun have so much light that everyone is quite agreed the only way to save them from Eternal Day is by some clever means to find a recipe for being blind. And so they cover up their eyes with dirty papers, full of lies, and save their children from the light by sowing ignorance and spite and educating them to hate boys of another solar state.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

Russia and Disarmament

I. Disarmament—An Address by M. Litvinoff*

I thank you for the honor you have done me in inviting me to take lunch with you today and giving me an opportunity of speaking to American citizens, a pleasure which I often have to deny myself. Your invitation reminds me once more of the discrepancy between reality and official admissions. Officially no relations exist between our countries, but nevertheless we know the enormous interest with which everything that goes on in the Soviet Union is followed in your country. The fact that there are more permanent newspaper correspondents from America in Moscow than from any other country is a sufficient proof of this. More visitors from America arrive annually at our capital even than from the continent of Europe. Finally, immense quantities of American machinery and tractors are in use in our factories and giant industrial enterprises, as well as in collective farms, and thousands of American engineers, mechanics and workers are taking an active part in the construction of our country. The people of the Soviet Union are also following life and literature in America with the greatest interest.

I read in the papers yesterday that as many as 65,000 Chinese troops are gathered at Shanghai, where fighting is going on. It must be assumed that there are at least as many if not more Japanese troops. This means fighting between armies running into hundreds of thousands, but officially there is no war. Here we have another example of the discrepancy between official testimony, official admission and reality.

But that is not what I wanted to talk about. It seems almost impossible to speak here on any other theme excepting those which are the center of interest in Geneva—at any rate international Geneva. Everybody here has one ear filled with talk of peace and disarmament, and the other with the voice of war, the clash of arms on the field of battle. We are all valiantly pretending that the discourses on future peace drown the voice of present war. When people here exchange impressions of the first weeks of the Conference, it is the thing to answer in a spirit of optimism, referring to the good beginning made and even to the defeat of those pessimists who had shaken their heads dolefully at the start. If I could really believe that optimism would help the Conference to succeed, would be of any use to the cause of disarmament and peace, believe me, ladies and gentlemen, you would hear from my lips the most sanguine utterances and rosy prophecies. We all know the Coué system, according to which any illness can be cured if only the sufferer assures himself continually that he is not ill at all, but is, on the contrary, "every day, in every way" better and better. I would agree to adopt this system, telling myself and others every minute that the Conference is going simply splendidly, that every day in every way we are disarming more and more, that peace and quiet prevail in the Far East, that the political independence of China has not been infringed, that the announcement of the separation of Manchuria from China merely happened to coincide with the occupation of Manchuria by foreign troops, and that moral disarmament has blunted the bayonets of both Japanese and Chinese troops, and converted cartridges, grenades and bombs into harmless squibs and fireworks.

Without wishing to cast any aspersions on the methods of the late Dr. Coué and his disciples for the treatment of the individual, I am bound to confess that I do not believe in this system when applied to the ills of the body politic. Here it seems to me that more optimism does not always inspire buoyancy and is not invariably a stimulus to action. Indeed history has taught us that contentment and complacency are far from being the motive powers of progress, while the coloring of facts is fraught with grave danger.

Turning to fact, I cannot see that we have more reason for optimism now than we had on the eve of the Conference. The Conference, it is true, has only just been born, after heavy and prolonged birth pangs, and has not as yet put on weight, or acquired a voice of its own, but the movements it has so far made, the sounds it has emitted, have not been such as to enable us to discern tokens of its future strength, capacity and powers.

For, after all, up to the present we have had nothing but the general declarations of delegations, we have learned the positions taken up by the various governments in these declarations. There was nothing new in all this; we knew it from the time of the Preparatory Commission. It seems to me that anything new we have heard points rather to a retreat from these positions still further away from disarmament. While the Preparatory Commission did at least discuss limitation and reduction, we now learn, at the Conference itself, that certain governments declared their entire disagreement with any reduction of armament whatsoever, unless preliminary conditions, which, moreover, will be found to be quite unacceptable to the Conference as a whole, are fulfiled. We have even heard demands for the increase of armaments, and that by no means from weak states, with low armaments. Then there is any number of questions involving serious principles on which the states represented in the Preparatory Commission differed widely. These differences prolonged the life of the Preparatory Commission by several years, and to judge by the first speeches made at the Conference they are no nearer to solution now.

Taking it all around, I can see no grounds for optimism.

If in addition to all this you take into consideration that in my opinion, the opinion of the Soviet Delegation, even the reduction of armaments (not to mention limitation) is but a weak palliative, bringing us no nearer to the only aim justifying the Conference being held in the present international situation, after thirteen years of arduous preparations and that this aim ought to be security against war, and that our appeal for total general disarmament, for the creation of this the only guarantee against war, has found no response at the Conference, you will readily understand that I am the last person from whom to expect a note of optimism.

Those new proposals which *have* been made at the Conference raise fears that the Conference itself might be side-tracked. We have always held that disarmament could only be interpreted either as the abolition or the reduction of armaments, and that the Conference should deal with the question of armaments. It

*Spoken at a luncheon given under the auspices of the American Committee and the International Club, Geneva.—Ed.

appears, however, that this view of the task of the Conference is not unanimously held. Even at the Preparatory Commission attempts were made to substitute the question of security for that of armaments. The Commission actually went out of its way to discuss questions relating to security, and no little time was spent there on. These discussions either led to no results or to results which were unsatisfactory to those concerned. I am not a little afraid that this attempt may be repeated at the Conference.

No one can have anything against security, nor has the Soviet Delegation, but we do say that, under the political and economic conditions prevailing in most countries, nations and states will only *have* security when no one can attack them, when there are no arms with which to attack, with which to occupy foreign territory, with which to subjugate other nations. The exponents of the opposite view see security only in the more or less leveling of the chances of victory, by the redistribution, or even the increase of armaments. But pre-war history also knew this sort of security. Does it really amount to anything more than the time-honored principle of the balance of power, which ruled pre-war diplomacy? This principle, which at the best only increased the security of some nations at the expense of others, did not save the world from the most terrible war it has ever known, from which it emerged with even less confidence in security than it had before. Was it really necessary to undergo all the horrors and disasters of World War, to spend 13 years preparing for a conference, to contrive all sorts of pacts and international treaties, in order to end up at the old principle of international diplomacy, merely slightly modified and modernized.

We are hearing a great deal about moral disarmament just now. Although we have not yet diminished existing military aggregates by a single unit, we are being asked to go in for moral disarmament. Again, nobody is going to say a word against moral disarmament, against the abolition of chauvinism and jingoism in press, literature, the cinema, school books, toys and the like, against the exposure of forged documents and the whole bag of tricks. I should be the last to object to such proposals, since there can hardly be any other country which has been the object of so much moral poison in press, public speaking, even official documents, as the Soviet Union. I might cite you, citizens of the United States, to bear testimony to the truth of this. No one knows better than you the attempts continually being made to poison the relations between our countries by systematic organized campaigns of slander, libel and forged documents, campaigns instigated by certain commercial and banking circles, with interests of their own to serve, political adventurers, counter-revolutionary emigrés, ready to sell themselves today to Japan, tomorrow to China, the next day to any old country. It is not then for *us* to object to measures directed against such gangsters of the printed and spoken word. But there is a time and a season for everything. Moral disarmament has just been made the subject of an international conference convened by the Danish Government, and the Soviet Union took part in it gladly and played an active part in it. But all this has little to do with the abolition or reduction of armaments, and for my part I am convinced that it is precisely the existence of armaments, and of big scale armaments, and the hopes, by means of these armaments and the help of alliances and treaties, of conducting profitable and successful wars, which create chauvinism, that poisoning of the wells of intelligence, which we are being invited to put an end to by administrative means alone.

Nobody will deny that profound differences—economic, political and even territorial—exist between capitalist states. There are countries which consider that neighboring states are wrongly and illegally occupying land which belongs to themselves, hence the agitation for the restoration of infringed rights, for the revision of frontier lines, and the like. But these differences are not to be settled by the fortunate owners of disputed territory merely saying to their neighbors: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive you yours." Not thus is history made, not thus are international relations changed. What we have got to see to is that these grievances, these dissatisfactions, should not lead to attempts to alter the situation by armed force, attempts which can only be prevented by the abolition of armaments, by the abolition of armed forces. So long as armed force exists there will be faith in it, and in the possibility of getting the upper hand of neighbors by increasing armaments, and through political combinations, inside or outside of international organizations. And so long as armed force exists chauvinism and militarism in education will continue. Moral disarmament cannot help here. It is bound to follow on actual disarmament, but can never be a substitute for it. Only when we have finished with the immediate task of the Conference and achieved appreciable success with regard to actual disarmament, shall we be free to discuss measures of moral disarmament also, which then and then only are sure to be crowned with a certain degree of success. Until then, in my opinion, the Conference ought not to waste its time and energy on anything else, but should concentrate on the fulfilment of the task for which it was convened, and it will need all its time and energy for that.

I may be told that governments are often compelled by public opinion in their own countries to maintain armaments and pursue chauvinistic policy, and that, therefore, as public opinion becomes more enlightened its pressure will lessen and governments will be more amenable to the idea of disarmament. I cannot share this view. Campaigns of chauvinism and national hatred, the setting of nation against nation, have never yet come from the heart of the masses. Such campaigns are always organized and artificially nourished by small groups interested in warlike preparations, the manufacture of munitions, and war industry, potential war profiteers. They very often succeed in poisoning the minds of the masses for their own ends. Deprive these groups of their base, remove them from war industry, destroy this industry, destroy their hopes of war and of profits to be drawn from war, and these campaigns will die out of themselves, for they will become pointless. Then you will have true moral disarmament, without the need of any special administrative measure. And so you see moral disarmament can only be brought about through physical disarmament, that is through the abolition of armaments. Once real soldiers have been got rid of, the world will have nothing to fear from tin soldiers.

That, then, is our opinion of proposals for moral disarmament. Such proposals foreign to real disarmament are not conducive to optimism at all. It seems to me that those who make them are sure in advance that the Conference will produce no real results; they

tell us beforehand: the Conference will not bring about disarmament or even any reduction of armaments, so let us go in for less ambitious matters and thus make sure of something, anyhow. I consider that to spend time on such proposals now would imply a declaration of bankruptcy, for the Conference would imply that we are convinced that the Disarmament Conference can only pay a penny in the pound.

Perhaps you will now understand why I abstain from hopeful forecasts.

If we attach any importance to the pressure of public opinion on the Conference we must realize what the better informed public opinion is as to all that goes on at the Conference, and the less it buoys itself up with false hopes, and consoles itself with illusions as to progress made, the stronger will that pressure be.

I should be sorry to leave you under the impression that we can see one point only to the exclusion of all others. As I have already said we do not ignore the importance of security, moral disarmament and all other good things which may be proposed to the Conference, but we are definitely against their being substituted for disarmament. The more time we spend talking about security and moral disarmament, the less we shall disarm, and the more we really do disarm, the more security and moral disarmament will be achieved.

In conclusion, I should like to remark that people do not always look for the causes of insecurity in the proper place. Some delegates at the Conference, for instance, even regarded the fact that the Soviet Union does not belong to the League of Nations as a cause of insufficient security. It is noteworthy that much misgivings were expressed by representatives of states themselves maintaining no relations with the Soviet Union. This is almost like trying to get a man, whose acquaintance you do not desire, to join your club. If, however, we are to look anywhere, outside of armaments themselves, for factors creating an alarming political atmosphere, mistrust and instability, we are more likely to find them in the existence of political and economic estrangements between several states on the one hand and the Soviet Union with its 160 million inhabitants on the other. In this respect we only have to glance at the events now going on on the shores of the Pacific, where three of the biggest Pacific countries, namely, the U. S. S. R., China and U. S. A., are involved in such estrangement. I don't think much imagination and political perspicacity are required to show the extent to which this circumstance has influenced, if it did not actually cause, present occurrences in the Far East, or to understand that but for this circumstance these unfortunate occurrences might not have arisen or might have looked quite different.

I am afraid, however, that I am getting on to slippery ground and digressing somewhat from my subject, as well as, it seems to me, abusing your patience. I will, therefore, only return for a moment to my original theme to express the wish that the work of the Disarmament Conference may justify the hopes of the most optimistic of you, and put my more cautious appraisal completely to shame.

II. The Russian Disarmament Proposals—Facing Realities

By Wilfred Wellock

(Political Agent to the War Resisters' International)

Once again Russia has compelled the League of Nations to face realities. But it is fully time the whole world faced realities in dealing with the profoundly important question of disarmament. In a sense it is the most important question of the age, for the plain fact is that if we again allow the dogs of war to get loose, the havoc produced will exceed all knowledge or calculation. Nor can we afford to allow ourselves to be persuaded into that philosophical state of mind which can look on complacently while the capitalist statesmen of the world in their blindness and folly permit another world crime to be perpetrated, in the belief that the resulting holocaust will end their reign forever and produce a world-wide revolution from which will emerge an era of universal Socialism. For while I believe that the result indicated would be the most likely outcome of another world war, I hold that the cost from every point of view, but particularly in human suffering, would be so enormous that we ought to do everything in our power to prevent it.

At the same time it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the capitalist States represented at the Disarmament Conference are jeopardizing the very system of society they are primarily anxious to defend, by hesitating to disarm.

Perhaps the most remarkable meeting yet held at Geneva in connection with the Disarmament Conference was that at which the Petitions were presented, including that organized by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which contained over 8,000,000 signatures—surely the biggest petition ever carried through! This was the people's day. Here spoke those who represented the world's democracies. They told the representatives what plain men and women everywhere were thinking. The most remarkable speech of the day was that delivered by Emile Vandervelde, the Belgian Socialist, who spoke on behalf of international Socialism. He demanded disarmament under the threat of revolution. "What happened in 1917?" he asked. "How do wars end—and how will the next war end?" It would be well to remember what Karl Marx said in this connection:

> But we must not forget that there is a sixth Power in Europe which at a definite moment will establish its domination over the other five so-called Great Powers and make every one of them tremble. This power is revolution. After a long period of calm and restraint it is now called again to the field of battle by crises and by the phantom of famine. At the required signal the sixth greatest European Power will come forth in shining armour, sword in hand . . .

Although they do not appear to know it, capitalist statesmen the world over, including, apparently, most of their representatives at Geneva, are clearly playing, with remarkable faithfulness, the rôle outlined for them by Marx.

But so far from facing the issue of drastic disarmament, it is to be doubted if the majority of the representatives now at Geneva even realize what is meant by disarmament. Many of them hold that their own particular country has already undertaken a large measure of disarmament, and that their present forces are the minimum required for defense. What absurdity! The truth is that outside the Central Powers there has been so far no real disarmament anywhere. It is true that in many cases expenditure has been reduced; but that is explained by the fact that there has taken place a greater concentration on those arms which are the most effective, but which happen also to be cheaper. The Washington Conference, for instance, checked the building of the big battleships and the London Naval Agreement continued the check,

but then it is well known that a very large body of naval opinion questions the value of the big battleship in modern warfare. Aeroplanes and submarines render the battleship largely useless, and it is that fact which makes the scrapping of the battleship acceptable to the experts which advise Governments. But there again, everybody knows that since the battleship has gone, naval experts have concentrated their attention on the 10,000 ton cruiser, and have so increased its speed and its fighting power that it has become a more formidable weapon of war in the present-day conditions than the battleship could possibly be.

The same sort of situation arises in regard to the land forces. It is true that in many cases land forces are being cut down. But at the same time mechanization is on the increase. During the last ten years the mechanization of the world's armies has proceeded at such a rate that the fighting power of most armies today, despite reductions in personnel, is 100 per cent greater than it was ten years ago. That fact has been acknowledged by the Minister of War in the British House of Commons.

But of course it is when we consider the Air Forces of the world that we realize the absurdity of saying that disarmament has taken place. Air Forces are rapidly expanding, while poison gas laboratories are everywhere in full operation. And when we think of the damage one aeroplane can do, and that a fleet of aeroplanes can be constructed for the price of a single battleship, we realize how absurd it is to say that disarmament has taken place.

The first round of speeches at the Disarmament Conference may be divided into three categories: (1) Those which seek to eliminate the more inhuman forms of slaughter from future warfare; (2) Those which favor the creation of a central war power or authority, like the League of Nations, and (3) Those which definitely envisage within a reasonable period total disarmament.

Great Britain and America might be said to represent the first view, France the second, and Russia the third. A little serious reflection ought to convince everyone that of these three points of view, that represented by Russia is the only one which faces the realities of the situation.

In regard to the first proposal, this appears to rest on the assumption that war can be made "gentlemanly," which is manifestly absurd. One need not go beyond the last war to realize the lengths to which nations will go in order to avoid defeat. When a nation is "up against it," it is inclined to accept no law but necessity, as was the case in the Great War. In order to secure support, the combatants made promises which were the denial of the very principle in whose defense they professed to be fighting, while international law was broken time and time again on both sides. Besides, how can it possibly be maintained that disemboweling men by the hundreds by means of shells and air bombs is less inhuman than poisoning them with gas? Moreover, in making such proposals as these, nations may easily be accused of seeking to eliminate those instruments of warfare which are most damaging to themselves. A naval Power, like Great Britain, has naturally more to fear from submarines than a country which relies mainly on its land or air forces. Thus there can be no hope of disarmament by this policy, as in the first place selection is bound to be artificial, to be surrounded by suspicion, and in the hour of crisis to be disregarded. Even now there exists a Convention against the use and manufacture of poison gas: but who heeds it? and which Government is not engaged in the making of poison gas? The verdict of experience is that war cannot be humanized, and unless it is outlawed it will completely shatter the entire structure of civilization.

The second proposal would appear to offer little or no prospect of disarmament. A nation which gave up a considerable percentage of its fighting forces to a central organization like the League of Nations, would probably be disinclined to reduce still further its already depleted forces. But there would be this further danger, that the proposed change would enable the Great Powers to dominate the whole world, and on the basis of a division of the spoils, to embark on schemes designed to bring within their control ever larger tracts of the earth's surface. A conclusive argument against this proposal, moreover, is that Russia could never consent to it, as the temptation would undoubtedly be to stimulate trouble with Russia, and in the name of "sane government" and "the cause of humanity" to embark on a huge crusade to end the Soviet regime.

Consequently the only practical proposals before the Conference are those for total disarmament brought forward by Russia. Since she brought forward similar proposals in 1927, a great advance in public opinion has taken place, and now there is a wide body of opinion in favor of such a course. Several of the lesser Powers are ready to support it, and several U. S. A. Senators have declared in its favor.

As the statement issued by the War Resisters' International on the Russian proposals declares, no one is fit to be trusted with such powerful death dealing instruments as are used in modern warfare, especially in moments of tense excitement when passion is stirred and the fear of attack is rampant. Civilization must not longer be imperiled by such situations. The only way of escape is that provided by the Russian proposals.

The Challenge of the Night

I hear the night wind calling
From out of a cold, cold world,
But I feel not the chill of the tempest,—
Safe in my snug bed curled.

Yet the wail of the wind disturbs me,
For it sounds like the cry of the sad,
The poor, the distracted and weary
Who nevermore can be glad.

I cannot enjoy my slumber
When the old world suffers so;
My comforts cease to give pleasure
While the anguished come and go.

I see the pale faces of children,
Like ghosts that pass in the night,
For why is it I am favored
While they are denied their right?

Out of the night comes a challenge,
And out of the storm a call,—
To share with my fellow workers
The goods that belong to all.

CHARLES G. GIRELIUS

In Memoriam: Dean Fenn

The death on March 6 of William Wallace Fenn, former Dean of the Harvard Divinity School, should call forth expressions of appreciation from many quarters, for Dean Fenn was greatly admired and beloved.

It has been my good fortune to have had many splendid teachers, indeed I have been extraordinarily lucky in this respect, and I therefore feel that I am saying something of importance when I place Dean Fenn high among these teachers and state that during the last twenty years none has been remembered with greater thankfulness or referred to more often.

It was during the academic year 1909-10 that, as a postgraduate student, I took Dean Fenn's two courses in "Theism" and in "Theology" respectively and saw something of himself and family in their home.

Coming as a mature student from the camp of the natural sciences, I was accustomed to see unwarranted flights of fancy forced back to reality by the necessities of the experimental method, and I had grown skeptical of those whose field lay beyond the salutary influence of the laboratory. But never have I seen more rigid criticism nor nicer distinctions between fact and inference than were exhibited by this theologian.

If in after life I came to regard the theistic hypothesis as unwarranted and if Dean Fenn's world view ceased to be my own, it was with the greater appreciation that I remembered his words at the beginning of his course in Theism, "Gentlemen, you may be atheists when you have finished this course, but if so, you will have to know why." Fenn was a firm theist and it was a matter I think of conscious choice of belief. He knew that when all the evidence of natural theology was in, there was a margin where one might still legitimately choose according to traditional bias. W. J. N. Sullivan has said somewhere that older views are not generally disproved, but come to look "funny" in a changed world. Theism had not come to look "funny" to Dean Fenn any more than special creation seemed to Agassiz to be incongruous with the extant data, the raw material for inferences.

I do not need to turn the pages of the treasured lecture notes on theism and theology which lie before me to be reminded of how orderly, lucid, stimulating and, upon occasion, eloquent his presentations were and how worthy of emulation in these respects. But I have found perhaps more vital his homely devices for attaining intellectual soundness. Let me give a few examples. "This statement of Blank is obviously absurd. But we must not take it at its face value. Blank is of course no fool. We must go behind the words and find out what Blank really meant, what he actually thought and why." Again, "In reviewing this book be sure that you can say 'This is what Blank wrote' and not be forced to own 'This is what I was thinking about when I seemed to be reading Blank.'"

Dean Fenn never presented another's point of view without making it completely his own for the time being. I remember his appeal on behalf of Roman Catholicism, which was enthusiastic and based apparently on conviction. Only in his subsequent criticism did he assume a judicial attitude. A. E. Haydon has this same gift. Every true teacher must also be an actor.

Dean Fenn was a great believer in what he called "the thinking pulpit" as distinct from the effort to arouse the emotions only or chiefly. And perhaps his insistence on this point may have had its influence in the genesis of my own belief that it is more important to teach rational and scientific *method* than to pass on the concrete discoveries themselves and that the factual content of a course is less important in itself than as an illustration of methods which should be generally employed in human thinking and find expression in human behavior.

As for Dean Fenn, the man, let me be counted among his hearty admirers, though I leave the exposition of this aspect of his personality to those who knew him more intimately than I. For I have thought that I would be doing that which is most appropriate and most appreciated by the readers of UNITY if I were to give expression to the way in which he impressed the "scientifically minded" who came into close intellectual relation with him.

PERCY M. DAWSON.

The Study Table

The Lyrics of Liberalism

H. W. Stephenson, who is a Unitarian minister in Ilminster, England, has made a unique and precious contribution to the literature of hymnology by this book* which gives sketches of twenty hymn writers, eleven English and nine American. The Englishmen are John Johns, John Bowring, Sarah Flower Adams, William Gaskell, Thomas Hincks, James Martineau, Stopford A. Brooke, John Page Hopps, Henry W. Hawkes, Ambrose N. Blatchford, and William G. Tarrant. The Americans are Frederick H. Hedge, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Theodore Parker, Edmund H. Sears, Samuel Longfellow, Samuel Johnson, John W. Chadwick, Frederick L. Hosmer, and William C. Gannett. Obviously and quite properly no living writer is included in this list.

What is a good hymn? Dr. Henry Sloan Coffin, editor of a hymn book, says it should be addressed to God, should be good poetry, lyrical and simple, it should voice a Christian experience that is wholesome but not subjective, it should be weighty not trivial in thought, its theology should not clash with the changing thought of the church, and it should continually prove its power to kindle religious emotion. Dr. Watts, whose hymns still appear in our hymn books, "continually insisted that his hymns were not poetry: they were measured verse, written in such fashion as to be understood by the meanest intelligence."

Martineau was not a great hymn writer, but he had a good influence on hymn writing because of his insistence upon literary and lyric value in hymns, and, in general, the absence of the didactic and homiletic element.

The hymn writers celebrated in this excellent book almost all address their hymns to God. They were representative of their generations. The newer doubts about the personality of God, and the recent enlarging of our conceptions of the cosmos, together with the

*"Unitarian Hymn Writers," by H. W. Stephenson. London: The Lindsey Press. 3/6.

present emphasis upon the dignity and worth of man were scarcely recognized by them. While they were in the front ranks of their times, we are surrounded by other conceptions than theirs, which have not yet got themselves expressed lyrically to a great extent. Let us hope that that expression will not long be delayed.

Dr. Louis F. Benson said once, "It is obvious that New England Unitarians led the advance in elevating the literary standard of American hymnody, an office for which their culture and free spirit naturally fitted them." Holmes's "Lord of all being," Sears's "It came upon the midnight clear," Hedge's "A mighty fortress is our God," Parker's "O thou great friend," Longfellow's "Again as evening's shadow falls," Johnson's "City of God, how broad and far," Chadwick's "It singeth low in every heart," Hosmer's "Forward through the ages," and Gannett's "Bring, O morn, thy music" have enriched the cause of worship more than the work of any similar group anywhere. But our English friends are not far behind. Adams' "Nearer, my God, to thee," Bowring's "In the cross of Christ I glory," Martineau's "Where is thy God? they say," Brooke's "When the Lord of love was here," Hopps' "Father, lead me day by day," Hawkes' "Amid the din of earthly strife," and Tarrant's "With happy voices ringing" have sung themselves into the hearts of many on this side of the water.

Mr. Stephenson gives for each author a critical estimate which is candid and free from panegyric, cites some of the hymns, and gives us the impression of a mastery of his sources and an original evaluation of each author. Finally, there is a bibliography and an index, crowning sign of good workmanship. The book is fascinating and informative. Hymnody would be bare without the work of these authors.

EDWIN FAIRLEY.

Rebel Poets

The third annual "Unrest" anthology of social vision poetry* sponsored by the Rebel Poets—The Internationale of Song—is the most ambitious and stirring volume of the series. It is dedicated to Tom Mooney—the Tom Mooney who peels vegetables at San Quentin in a filthy, windowless dungeon for seven hundred meals a day. It contains the striking tribute to Mooney of that eloquent lover of his fellowmen, William Ellery Leonard, as well as poems by such literary headliners as Sherwood Anderson, Arthur D. Ficke, Witter Bynner, Lola Ridge, C. E. S. Wood, and Clement Wood. Contributors to UNITY are represented by the distinguished work of Robert Whitaker, Kenneth Porter, E. Merrill Root, Fania Kruger, and also Angela Morgan with her touching poem on the miners. Many of the poems in this collection first appeared in UNITY

These poets hurl their rhythmic lances against the walls of a society which, to quote Paul Hutchinson on the Mooney case, "is under doom of its own spiritual disintegration." Some reviewers have called this "a book of hate." What poet who has the heart to feel can keep utterly free from bitter thoughts in a land abundant with food but crowded with starving people! But it is rather a book of love for human potentialities.

This volume has been criticized also for containing for the most part the work of lesser-known poets. It is frankly in large measure no condescending expression of pity for the underdog but the direct utterance of the oppressed themselves. This very fact makes this book particularly important. If many of the stars in our poetic firmament, like Robinson, Teasdale, Untermeyer and others of their type, are missing, it is because, safe in their ivory towers, they are not dealing with the burning issues before humanity today. Their poetry has failed to possess any non-trivial significance in the face of this crisis of our generation.

These "Unrest" poets who have dared to decry the brutalities and hypocrisies of this age should be revered by all who are looking toward new horizons of social welfare. Man acts through the emotions—through the heart, "which makes all living great." Those represented in "Unrest" will be remembered and glorified in the new world toward which we strive.

LUCIA TRENT.

*"Unrest, 1931," edited by Jack Conroy and Ralph Cheyney. Published by Henry Harrison, New York. $1.75.

Remake America!

Here are two books* from well known men, highly characteristic of the times in which they are published. In a way they supplement each other. Both tell of conditions in America today. Both are critical of those conditions. Mr. Ernst, who has championed good causes, both in his books and in the courts, notably freedom of press and speech, gives a scintillating survey of the bewildering anomalies of American life. The good and the bad are brought into paradoxical juxtaposition. Want in the presence of dazzling extravagance, hypocrisies and inconsistencies without number parade before the reader in highly interesting procession. The lawyer gives us the scenario of the dramatist.

Will Durant, on the other hand, marshals the facts first for the plaintiff, then for the defendant, after the manner of the lawyer. With equal brilliance he too sets forth the pros and cons of the American scene with a greater emphasis on the pros than Mr. Ernst gives. Both books make good and interesting reading.

But your reviewer lays them both down with the feeling that they are *slight* books; that they have been given off without a serious plowing of the subsoils. It would be an exaggeration, perhaps, to call them flippant, but no more so than to call them philosophical. Neither of them sounds the note which the biographers of Jesus do when they record of him that "seeing the multitudes, he was moved with compassion;" or when on the hill above Jerusalem he is said to have wept over the doomed city, and to have uttered the memorable words, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," etc. This is by no means to say that one must be a "Jesus man," or a preacher, but only that when one publishes a book at least some of his readers will hope for something more deeply penetrating, not to say philosophical than either of these books seems to your reviewer to possess.

JAMES A. FAIRLEY.

*"America's Primer," by Morris L. Ernst. Published by Putnam's; "A Program for America," by Will Durant. Published by Simon and Schuster.

Note

Two hymn books of unusual character and interest, published within recent months, contain hymns written by John Haynes Holmes.

The first of these hymnals is the "Union Hymnal" prepared by the Central Conference of American Rabbis for use in Jewish worship. This handsome book, prepared with great skill and devotion, contains Mr.

Holmes's "O God Whose Law From Age to Age," "O Thou Whose Presence Moved Before," "God of the Nations Near and Far," "The Voice of God Is Calling," and "O Father Thou Who Givest All."

The second hymnal, most interesting to an Occidental, is the "Revised Japanese Hymnal" published by the Union Hymnal Committee of Japan. This volume contains a collection of over six hundred hymns all presented in the Japanese text. The hymns by Mr. Holmes which appear in this volume are "Almighty God Beneath Whose Eye," "The Voice of God Is Calling," and "God of the Nations Near and Far."

Correspondence

Seminar in Mexico

Editor of UNITY:

May I call the attention of your readers to the Seventh Seminar in Mexico scheduled to meet in Mexico City July 3-23?

The Seminar in Mexico is a "cooperative study of Mexican life and culture." Its membership is open to people who have an interest in international relations and who have a genuine desire to understand the Mexican people. The three weeks' program of the Seminar includes lectures, round table conferences and field trips.

The lectures, given by authorities in Mexico, present various phases of Mexican life in the fields of education, art, international relations, economics, music, folk lore, sociology and government. Among the leaders who will lecture before the Seminar are Moises Saenz, Carlos Chavez, Ramon Beteta, Diego Rivera and Rafael Ramirez.

The round tables give small groups the opportunity to study and discuss some subject in their particular field of interest. The leaders and their subjects in this year's session include Judge Florence E. Allen on International Relations, Dr. Ernest Gruening on Economics, Count Rene d'Harnoncourt on Arts and Crafts, Dr. Charles W. Hackett on the History of Mexico, Miss Elizabeth Wallace on Latin American Literature. Of special interest this year will be the round table on Archaeology lead by Dr. Frans Blom. Among other subjects, this group will study the recent discoveries made at Monte Alban and at the close of the Seminar a trip will be made to Oaxaca to study the pyramids themselves.

Field trips will be made to Puebla, Oaxtepec, Xochimilco, Cuautla, Cuernavaca, and Taxco where members of the Seminar will be guests at the "casa" of the Committee. The object of these trips is to visualize the historical background, to see the schools at work and to understand the indigenous culture of Mexico.

Mexico is an excellent place for a vacation. The summer is cool and the country affords many tempting opportunities.

Inquiries and applications should be addressed to:

HUBERT C. HERRING.
Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America.
112 *East 19th Street.*
New York City.

A Sad Commentary

Editor of UNITY:

Not so many years ago, Chicago compared favorably with other cities in cleanliness—especially in its street-cleaning department. But what changes have come upon us during the last few demoralizing years! Now we have a community of unemployed. Pleas and exhortations beset us on every side. Huge sums are needed—food for the hungry, fuel and clothing for the cold, medicine for the ill, work for the idle. Give, give, give until it hurts! At present there is a crusade to find jobs for the jobless. But where are the jobless? Until the warm sun melted the last heavy snow, one might wander from one end of the city to the other without finding a dozen men looking for an opportunity to shovel snow and make a few honest dollars. And what was our city doing? Apparently, nothing! One could paddle through snow and puddles and slide and slip on the icy pavements. One could motor over ruts and hillocks—bumpetty, bumpetty, bump, as the motors threw up showers of slush, half covering the pedestrians. In town the snow was banked close to the pavements; passengers alighted and often looked vainly for a dry path to the sidewalk; indeed, they often motored away in despair —leaving that particular errand to some future time. With all this army of unemployed, why couldn't—*why shouldn't* —the city put part of them to work, making it a decent place for its inhabitants? Has charity become such a fetish with us that it is already taking the place of work and independence? Ah, we have indeed become a meek and lowly people to put up with this state of affairs!

H. S. N.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 114)

and send in at once a membership contribution. Address: Miss Eleanor Metzel, Secretary, 383 Bible House, New York City.

An Open Letter

[From members of the Women's International League of Peace and Freedom]

"To the United States Senators:

"Gentlemen:

"The Geneva Conference on Disarmament is meeting under peculiar difficulties. The conflict in the Far East is being used as an argument against a general reduction of arms, under the belief that had China been as well armed as Japan there would have been no Japanese intervention in Manchuria. Is not the contrary equally true, that had there been an agreement between the nations of the world by which all, Japan and China included, had been reducing armaments, the Japanese military party would not have ventured on a career of conquest? In other words, if the Disarmament Conference could have met earlier to carry out the provisions for universal disarming anticipated in the Versailles Treaty, the world might have been spared the spectacle of two countries in deadly conflict, while their representatives are among the sixty nations met to discuss reduction of arms.

"A counter-weight to this situation is the overwhelming expression of popular will to disarm throughout the world, represented by millions of signatures on petitions presented to the Disarmament Conference from citizens of most of the countries participating, including about 200,000 from China and Japan.

"We, citizens of the United States of America, take pride in the stand taken by our Delegation to the Disarmament Conference for a policy of universal reduction of arms coupled with abolition of the more frightful methods of warfare, and we rejoice that this program has been approved by a majority of nations.

"In our desire to uphold our Delegation and to assure them that their country is with them in their courageous program, we call upon you, our representatives in the Senate, which will have the duty of acting upon whatever measures are adopted at Geneva, to convey to Mr. Hugh Gibson and his associates our assurance that we are prepared to back them in every reasonable effort to bring about marked and progressive reduction of international armaments, for the purpose of realizing the disarmament provision of the Versailles Treaty, and implementing the Kellogg Pact."

Gandhi and Englishmen

One of the last acts of Mahatma Gandhi before he was taken away to Yeravda was to convey through Mr. V. Elwyn (late of the Christa Seva Sangha) a message of love to all Englishmen. The message breathes the spirit of goodwill and conveys an assurance that based as it is on Satyagraha, the new struggle would be carried on without ill-feeling or malice on the part of the Congress:

"I love them (Englishmen) as I love my own countrymen. I have never done anything towards them in hatred or malice, and God willing, I shall never do anything in that manner in future. I am acting no differently towards them now from what I have done under similar circumstances towards my own kith and kin."

An Intelligent America

READERS OF UNITY will remember that about a year ago there was published in this journal a full page advertisement calling for a campaign on behalf of a larger subscription list. Apparently the campaign ceased with that single appeal.

"NEVER EXPLAIN," was, in substance, the advice of a great American philosopher. The advice is not to be taken too literally. But in this instance we prefer to follow the example of Oliver Wendell Holmes, who after many years of silence on the part of the Breakfast Table Philosopher resumed with the remark: "As we were saying————."

OUR PROGRAM, however, has widened with the year of meditation and experiment. It is indicated, briefly, below.

AMERICA, AND IN PARTICULAR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, holds a strategic place in world affairs today. This does not need to be argued, or expanded here.

AN INTELLIGENT AMERICA is a primary and fundamental world need. How can we work best toward that end?

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, which gave us our independence from England, was put over in its initial stages, 1763-1775, through CORRESPONDENCE COMMITTEES, and the printed page. THE CORRESPONDENCE COMMITTEES acted as a kind of CLEARING HOUSE for exchange of information and stimulation, and were the prelude out of which came the UNION later.

FOR TEN YEARS I have been touring the Pacific Coast, and carrying on, individually and collectively, world studies, toward the end of securing a greater coordination here among men and women of open mind and progressive principles.

AN EXPANDING GROUP OF US, acting under the name of THE INTELLIGENT AMERICA FELLOWSHIP, are seeking now to enlist others at large in the same enterprise.

WE PROPOSE NO FORMAL MEMBERSHIP, NO DUES, NO INSTITUTIONAL EMPHASIS. In a few words we can define the lines of cooperation in which we seek your fellowship.

FIRST; we are asking whoever gets this message to accept as a definite objective of their own thought and effort, A MORE INTELLIGENT AMERICA.

TO THIS END, we suggest a systematic devotion of a settled portion of your time to these two specific ends: (1) An acquaintance with the world-setting in which human experience is worked out. **By this is intended such a study of maps, and auxiliary helps, as will enable you to visualize the world as a whole, and to hold in mind the outstanding features of any and every country in the world.** India's problem, for instance, is illuminated marvellously when one studies the situation in which India lies, **under the southern eaves of the roof of the world,** and **the meaning of mountains** in such a situation. Japan's geography and geology have played havoc with the sentimentalisms of platitudinous peace propaganda. WE MUST UNDERSTAND THE WORLD TO LEAD THE WORLD TOWARD UNITY AND PEACE. Will you join us in a WORLD WIDE STUDY OF THE SETTING OF PHYSICAL CIRCUMSTANCE IN WHICH HUMAN INTERESTS ARE INVOLVED? We will gladly aid you with whatever suggestions we can give.

FURTHERMORE, AND TOWARD THE SAME END, we suggest a systematic devotion of at least a few minutes a day, on the average, to (2) an acquaintance with THE MAIN OUTLINES OF HUMAN EXPERIENCE, that is, the major currents of human history.

OUR SLOGAN IS, with no impeachment of whatever belongs to the sub-structure or superstructure of human existence, that WE ARE WHAT WE ARE BECAUSE WE ARE WHERE WE ARE, AND WHEN WE ARE.

WE ARE WHAT WE ARE BECAUSE WE ARE WHERE WE ARE. If you were in JAPAN, instead of in the UNITED STATES, your reactions would be conditioned very considerably by that fact. How considerably most of us fail to realize, BECAUSE WE KNOW NEITHER JAPAN NOR THE UNITED STATES AS WE SHOULD.

WE ARE WHAT WE ARE BECAUSE WE ARE WHEN WE ARE. The PROCESS OF HISTORY is as imperative a fact as the SETTING OF HISTORY. The Americans of the Eighteenth Century were not involved as are the Americans of the Twentieth Century.

THUS ENDETH THE FIRST LESSON. If there is enough interest we are going to continue these lessons in UNITY, now and then. I have no secretary, and no money to engage one. Our group is made up of folks likewise limited in means, time, and strength. Nevertheless we will be glad to have a shower of letters. If you want an individual reply send us a stamped and addressed envelope, and any other contribution you may wish to make toward clerical work. We are hiring no offices, paying no salaries, seeking no profits. But we would like to expand this appeal. Moreover we would like to make UNITY the medium for a WORLD CONTACT, and especially for THE COORDINATION OF EFFORT TOWARD AN INTELLIGENT AMERICA on the part of any and all who will work with us to that end.

For further information address me at our new residence, as follows: Robert Whitaker, 1016 West 106th Street, Los Angeles, California.

Yours for AN INTELLIGENT AMERICA.